

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION****January 8, 1998**

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Tom Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Susan Barron, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Tom Gallegos, Mary Harlow, Victor Holm, Susan Johnson, Bob Kanick, Jim Kinsinger, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall, David Navarro, Linda Sikkema / Steve Gunderson, Rob Henneke, Jeremy Karpatkin, Joe Legare**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Tom Clark, Paul Grogger**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Kenneth Werth (citizen); J. Jones (citizen); Carol Barker (RF retiree); Diana Buskirk (citizen); Gary Schuetz (DOE); DeAnne Butterfield (RFLII); John Rampe (DOE); David Cooper (PBST Inc.); Will Neff (RFLII); Alan Trenary (citizen); Linda McCreery (Communications); Carl Sykes (DOE-RFFO); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

Comment: Kenneth Werth: I have an article from the *Rocky Mountain News*. It mentions a company, Tenera Inc. of San Francisco, which has finalized a contract for its subsidiaries. The contract expands its role in management at Rocky Flats, where the company will be responsible for the selection and management of some subcontractors involved in the cleanup. I've never heard of this company. I would like to know what Tenera is involved with, regarding technology, at the site.

Response: Joe Legare: I don't have an answer on that company, but I will get back to you and the Board with a response. Jack Hoopes: Tenera is one of Kaiser-Hill's subcontractors. I'm not prepared to give you the scope of what they are doing for Rocky Flats. But we can get that information to you.

PRESENTATION ON THE ROCKY FLATS LOCAL IMPACTS INITIATIVE REUSE TASK FORCE (Will Neff - RFLII, and David Cooper - Post, Buckley, Schuch & Jernigan). Representatives from RFLII discussed the status of the Industrial Area transition project. This project began following the work of the Future Site Use Working Group (FSUWG), which was convened to determine what to do with the Rocky Flats site after closure. The FSUWG recommended the buffer zone be set aside as open space in perpetuity, and that the Industrial Area could possibly be redeveloped following cleanup. The Task Force is looking at options for redevelopment, such as a technology center, so there is an economic benefit to areas around Rocky Flats. The Task Force will determine how the Industrial Area is to be reused, and provide a plan to outline how that might be achieved. A team of consultants have been hired by RFLII, with a budget of \$145,000 to

SW-A-005325

ADMIN RECORD

work over an eight-month period. The team is about halfway through its process, having completed most of the data gathering/research aspect, and ready to begin work on the planning stage.

Key assumptions are:

1. there will be no onsite use until cleanup to RFCA standards is completed
2. DOE will continue to be responsible for stewardship of the site following cleanup; and
3. the Industrial Area will be cleaned to a level compatible with an employment center.

Meetings of the group to date have focused on information gathering and analysis. Some scenarios are currently being developed, and a few have been suggested such as an employment center with an industrial emphasis; a "Cold War" memorial and museum/research center; onsite development in conjunction with the memorial/museum; a land bank for future use - or leaving the site in an undeveloped state in anticipation of future uses; or making the entire site open space and allowing passive recreation such as hiking and wildlife viewing. RFLII will host a series of public meetings to gather input. In addition, there will be developed an interactive web site so people can be polled and leave information on preferred options and their views. A proposed recommendation is expected to be prepared by April 1998.

Q&A / Comment Session:

Comment: Eugene DeMayo: Your assumption about cleanup is wrong. The FSUWG made a decision to support redevelopment in the industrial zone based on the assumption that the site would be cleaned up to background levels, which DOE has promised they will not do. It was contingent on that. If the site is cleaned up to some other level, then you don't have the support of the FSUWG.

Question: Victor Holm: One of the reasons for the redevelopment is to continue the employment base in the area. Because of the assumption that cleanup will take place before redevelopment, I'm concerned that there may be a hiatus, or they won't dovetail very well. Also, how are you going to evaluate the future liability of worker health?

Answer: David Cooper: The intent is that the reuse not conflict with the cleanup. The economic redevelopment will occur after cleanup, but not necessarily after the total cleanup of the site. The Task Force is looking at where the opportunities exist for when to look at redevelopment. DOE is thinking about how to handle possible future lawsuits based on contamination. The hope is that the U.S. government will indemnify against any future problems, and that they would be responsible. Some principles need to be established. But the underlying assumption is that the site will be cleaned up.

Question: Beverly Lyne: In terms of outreach to the public, I am concerned about doing statistical analysis on the website. That's not a random sample, not a representative sample of the public. Also, the \$145,000 for the consultants fee, is that for all of you?

Answer: Will Neff: The information from the website will not be treated as a representative sample. David Cooper: Yes, the \$145,000 is for all six on the consultant team. We are very focused.

Question: David Navarro: I'm curious why you didn't just reconvene the FSUWG to look into this?

Answer: DeAnne Butterfield: First, there are individuals involved with the FSUWG who are no longer in their positions. But also, the focus of this group is on reuse of the industrial area as an employment center, and there are people who have things to contribute to that discussion who weren't part of the FSUWG. It's not an identical mix of interests, and we believe this group provides the best possible representation on issues specific to the industrial area.

Comment: David Navarro: The one building and equipment that would have been ideal is 460. It's unfortunate that the equipment all ended up going somewhere for virtually nothing, all those employees were laid off, and the building is now being used as an office complex. That was the one jewel that could have been a positive for reuse.

Question: Tom Davidson: I'm assuming the redevelopment of the industrial area is based on a perceived need for additional industrial land. A Trammell-Crow study completed about a year-and-a-half ago showed at current growth rate, there is enough vacant zoned industrial land within the Denver metro area to last 104 years. Where is the perceived need to redevelop this land?

Answer: David Cooper: We are aware of those numbers. The way we are interpreting the problem is employment of an industrial nature, and in the range of uses that would be considered, it may possibly be public facilities. Demand for those facilities doesn't figure into the conventional market analysis. The focus is, how might this site contribute to employment in the area. One direction we're looking at, because of a lot of the uncertainties, is a land bank. That would clean it up, make it ready, and say in 8-10 years start making decisions about how to use it.

Comment: Tom Marshall: This is a comment directed to DOE as much as RFLII. I want to remind you that site reuse and future site use does fall under the purview of CAB. When the FSUWG began, it preceded CAB. When RFLII began this project, my recommendation was that the FSUWG be reconvened. That didn't happen. This process right now is said to be a continuation of the FSUWG. Some of those individuals are not in their positions, but a number of them are, and those entities still exist. It would seem to make sense for DOE to approach CAB to talk about how our future site decisions are going to be made. We would be happy to work with RFLII on it. This process is part of a larger future site use process. There is a proposal for another meeting to deal with that. My hope is that DOE will try to look at this in a comprehensive manner and CAB will be involved in that.

Response: DeAnne Butterfield: For the record, members of the FSUWG were invited to participate in the Task Force. There were a number of them who declined. We are trying our best to keep everyone informed. I do want to point out that invitations were issued to people from FSUWG and to the institutions they represented. Will Neff: In the public participation process, we envision CAB being a major source of input during that process. We are hoping to schedule at least one other meeting like this once the recommendations start to take shape, and we also plan on asking CAB for their recommendation based on the findings of the Task Force. Jeremy Karparkin: Yes, CAB will be involved, and yes, our land use planning will be comprehensive.

Comment: Mary Harlow: I am a member of the Task Force, and I would like everyone to know that the City of Westminster would not support digging on that site. The contamination is not just on the surface. We think it would be foolish to dig in that area. In our estimation, the site is not suitable for any type of development.

Question: Bob Kanick: The scenarios which were presented to the Task Force, I take it this is not a definitive list, and that it can be amended?

Answer: David Cooper: This was only an exercise to try to identify possible elements. It wasn't a list of alternatives. This was to help discuss some of the issues related to future use at the site. There is room for other proposals. Will Neff: The scenarios are not fixed in any way, and they are not the only ones being considered by the Task Force.

Question: Bob Kanick: Is the idea of using the site as a low-level waste dump being considered?

Answer: Will Neff: We have not discussed that. David Cooper: We are assuming a cleaned up site.

Comment: David Navarro: As a member of the FSUWG, I was invited to participate. One of the things we struggled with was when to meet and where. We met in the evenings. A note for you, that's what keeps me from being involved, I can't break away for daytime meetings.

Question: Jim Kinsinger: We've talked about having a cleaned up facility. What is your definition for that?

Answer: Will Neff: To RFCA standards.

Question: Kenneth Werth: Since I've lived here over 60 years, Arvada has become landlocked. The only way they can expand is northwest toward Rocky Flats. I know there will be a fight between Boulder, Broomfield, Westminster, Arvada and Golden. Is there some way you can get in touch with these governments and discuss your plans with them? If Rocky Flats is ever cleaned up, Arvada will be first in line looking at that for a tax base.

Answer: David Cooper: A part of our process involved extensive interviews with communities. We went to all the jurisdictions to get a clear understanding of their issues. That was part of our data gathering. Also, the Task Force includes representation from each of those communities.

Question: Kenneth Werth: How long is your contract for?

Answer: David Cooper: We anticipate having our final report by April.

Question: Tom Marshall: What is behind the assumption that we need to have an industrial reuse at the site?

Answer: David Cooper: My understanding is that the cleanup level for the industrial area had to be at a level that would allow industrial use. Also, there was an interest in some kind of environmental technology center. The Task Force is looking at uses for the area in terms

of the regional economy - how can the reuse have a role in the employment and economic picture of the region.

Comment: Tom Marshall: I would like to receive from RFLII a schedule of your briefings for the press and for local governments.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE BUILDING 779

DECOMMISSIONING OPERATIONS PLAN (Mary Harlow): The D&D / Closure Plan Focus Group submitted a draft recommendation for the Board's review, which forwards to DOE comments on the Building 779 Decommissioning Operations Plan (DOP). This recommendation asks DOE:

1. to ensure that the DOP contain adequate contingency plans and procedures to meet any unexpected situations, and to develop those contingencies prior to beginning D&D work;
2. to keep all protective and monitoring system in operational condition - specifically to regularly check and maintain the HEPA filters, and to include real-time beryllium monitoring during D&D work;
3. to certify that surplus equipment be certified as clean and removed expeditiously from the building prior to performing work;
4. to develop a schedule of activities with a timeline and completion date for all work needing completion prior to demolition of the building;
5. to prepare a containment system in the staging area for building rubble - to catch runoff from storm events so that no chemical contaminants migrate into surface waters leaving the site;
6. to provide CAB with a copy of DOE's draft order on Life Cycle Asset Management - and to develop more fully its restoration plans so that actions taken during D&D complement an overall restoration scheme;
7. to keep stakeholders informed about progress with D&D work, and provide opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness and success of ongoing work; and
8. to use the most effective and safest technologies available for D&D work.

Decision: *Approve recommendation, with changes suggested by Board members.*
APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

UPDATE ON DNFSB ISSUES (Bob Warther): Bob reviewed a few of the issues DNFSB is monitoring at the site:

- startup of salt oxidation will begin on January 9 in Building 707;
- the Board is following the installation and status of the plutonium stabilization and packaging line - there are some issues with this project and its schedules;

- characterization is in process in Building 707, to help understand what is in the drums and cans, and to determine whether further processing of residues is necessary;
- work is beginning in Building 771 on tapping and draining piping and the bottoms of tanks - there are still holdup solutions remaining in the building;
- caustic waste treatment continues in Building 371, in order to implement upgrades based on the Board's recommendation 94-3.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Alan Trenary: I'm very interested in the BNFL project out in Broomfield, and I would like to know if we will get an opportunity to see it again. When we went before, it was about a third to halfway done. I'd like to see it in more of a completed state to help understand how it will operate.

Response: Joe Legare: Yes, if we work with Kaiser-Hill public relations, we can perhaps set up an opportunity for people to see it. Ken Korkia: The Plutonium Issues Focus Group had scheduled an update on the progress of that facility for our January meeting. We have changed the agenda and will now have an update on the packaging line now in February. Perhaps we can set it up to have the meeting at the facility.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE RESIDUES

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (Mary Harlow): The Plutonium Issues Focus Group had submitted a draft recommendation to the Board for its approval. The recommendation would transmit comments on the Plutonium Residues Environmental Impact Statement. However, Board members had disagreement on much of the text of the recommendation, so it was returned to the focus group for review and rewrite. The deadline for comments on the EIS has expired, so CAB will send a letter to DOE-HQ asking for an extension, so that it may submit comments on this EIS.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Personnel Committee Report. Cost-of-living salary increases were approved for Erin Rogers and Deb Thompson.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: February 5, 1998, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, lower-level Multi-Purpose Room, 4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster

Agenda: *Discussion and follow-up from State of the Flats meeting; comments and recommendations on Plutonium Residues EIS*

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

1. Revise and send letter of recommendation regarding DOP - Ken Korkia

2. Review and revise draft recommendation on Residues EIS - Plutonium Issues Focus Group
3. Prepare letter asking DOE to extend public comment period on Residues EIS - Ken Korkia

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:40 P.M. *

(* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.)

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Tom Gallegos, Secretary
Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)